

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 23, 2004, the Examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure and rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,743,712 to Turpin et al. (hereinafter, "Turpin").

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1-15. Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully traverse the above-noted objections and rejections for the following reasons.

Applicants have amended the Abstract in light of the Examiner's remarks in the last Office Action (please see the Replacement Abstract attached hereto). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the Abstract.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turpin. Amended claim 1 recites steps of "providing a logic view with nodes to represent the layout items, wherein the logic view displays labels associated with the nodes to visualize structure information of the form, displays a processing order of the layout items defined by the position of the nodes, displays at least one of the nodes as a selected node to represent a selected layout item." Independent claims 8 and 10 contain similar language, and dependent claims 2-7, 9, and 11-15 depend directly or indirectly upon one of claims 1, 8, or 10.

The Examiner concedes that Turpin does not explicitly teach visualizing structure information of the form. (Office Action at 4). Nevertheless, the Examiner contends that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the invention of Turpin et al. to provide the capability (a) to visualize structure information of the form, since Turpin et al. do teach *the Definition of decision tree*

structures comprising branches and conclusions which are assigned to the fields of the forms which comprise a related stack of forms (Turpin, Column 12, lines 28-31)." Office Action at pg. 4 (emphasis in original). The Examiner further notes that "it would be advantageous for advanced users of the invention of Turpin et al. to be able [to] see and/or visualize the structure in order to help them better understand the form they are creating." Office Action at pg. 4.

Applicants note that that the Examiner argues obviousness of the present invention based upon what "advanced users of Turpin" would understand. Because the standard for obviousness is relevant to those of ordinary skill in the art, the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 based upon "advanced users of Turpin" is improper. Accordingly, Turpin fails to render claim 1 obvious for at least this reason.

Further, Turpin discloses a "system for creation and completion of goal oriented electronic forms [that] creates a graphical image data file which defines: a graphical image of a form for display and printing; a graphical image of tree branches, tree nodes, and conclusions in association with fields of the form; reading and writing links between form fields and data sources and destinations; and links to other forms which, with the original form, comprise a stack of forms." Turpin, Abstract. The system operates in two modes: form creation and run time. *Id.* Trees are defined by an application developer using the form creation mode to establish qualitative and quantitative relationships between the various fields on the forms thereby providing the basis for the goal oriented prompting for the application user using the run time mode. Turpin, Abstract. Definition of branches and conclusions do not constitute "providing a logic view with nodes to represent the layout items, wherein the logic view displays labels associated with the

nodes to visualize structure information of the form,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, these definitions provide the basis for the goal oriented prompts for a user filling out the form (See Turpin, Abstract). Turpin therefore fails to teach each and every element of claim 1.

Moreover, the Examiner’s contention that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify Turpin to provide the capability “to visualize the structure information” is conclusory and unsupported by Turpin. In addition, the Examiner has failed to establish that the proposed modification to Turpin would have any reasonable expectation of success.

Claims 8 and 10, while of different scope, recite limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. For example, claim 8 recites “a display for providing a tree view with tree nodes to represent the layout items, wherein the tree view displays labels associated with the tree nodes to visualize structure information of the form,” and claim 10 recites “providing a logic view with nodes to represent the layout items, wherein the logic view displays labels associated with the nodes to visualize structure information of the form.” Claims 8 and 10 therefore are distinguishable over Turpin at least for reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1.

In light of the above-described deficiencies of Turpin, Applicants submit that claims 1, 8, and 10 are allowable over the applied reference. Moreover, claims 2-7, 9, and 11-15 are allowable at least due to their dependence from one of claims 1, 8, or 10.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

David Dolan

Reg. No. 34,731

Dated: December 15, 2004

By: _____

Linda J. Thayer
Linda J. Thayer
Reg. No. 45,681

Attachments: Replacement Abstract (1 page)